

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 10-13, and 16-22 have been amended and Claims 8, 9, 14, and 15 have been cancelled without prejudice. As a result, Claims 1-7, 10-13, and 16-22 remain pending in the present application. Support for the amendments is found in the specification and claims as filed. Accordingly, the amendments do not constitute the addition of new matter. Reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected Claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being incomplete. Claims 14 and 15 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claim 10 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 15 and to present process steps. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at page 24, lines 20-24.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-8, 10-14, 16-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Toshio et al. (60-058055) or Takaaki et al. (01-206965) or Kunihiro et al. (05-328934) or Lewis et al. (5,858,446) and Greff (5,750,181).

According to M.P.E.P. 2143.03, if an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.

The Examiner indicated that Claim 9 is allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner also indicated that Claim 15 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 9 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 9. Accordingly, Claim 1 and dependent claims therefrom, namely Claims 2-7, 16, 18-22, are allowable.

Appl. No. : 09/807,731
Filed : April 16, 2001

Claim 15 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claim 10 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 15 and present process steps. Accordingly, Claim 10 and dependent claims therefrom, namely Claims 11-13 and 17, are allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Amendment to the Specification

The Examiner pointed out that the use of trademark COMITROL should be capitalized and accompanied by the generic terminology. The specification has been amended to capitalize the term COMITROL and add accompanying generic terminology.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing amendments and comments, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited.

The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to all of the rejections in the case and to place the claims in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully invited to call the undersigned in order to resolve such issues promptly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: May 12, 2003

By: 
Connie C. Tong
Registration No. 52,292
Agent of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404